

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Claims 1, 15, and 18-34 have been amended. Claims 35 and 36 have been added. No claims have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Therefore, Claims 1-36 are pending in the application.

Each issue raised in the Office Action is addressed hereinafter.

I. ISSUES NOT RELATED TO THE PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 18-34 – 35 U.S.C. § 101 – PROPAGATED SIGNALS

Claims 18-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action states that ‘the “computer-readable medium” would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art as failing to fall within a statutory category of invention, because applicant’s disclosure defines “computer-readable medium” to include propagated signals (e.g., “light waves”; see page 16).’ Office Action, page. 2. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Present Claims 18-34 recite “A computer-readable **storage** medium **storing...**” Examples of storage media described in the application include “a floppy disk, a flexible disk, hard disk, magnetic tape, or any other magnetic medium, a CD-ROM, any other optical medium, punchcards, papertape, any other physical medium with patterns of holes, a RAM, a PROM, and EPROM, a FLASH-EPROM, any other memory chip or cartridge,” as described in the application, paragraph [0063]. All such storage media constitute a statutory “apparatus” or “manufacture.” Present Claims 18-34 exclude propagated signals. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is fully addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. ISSUES RELATED TO THE PRIOR ART

A. CLAIM 1 – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) – WANG

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Wang, et al. (U.S. Pub# 2003/0035409) (hereinafter “Wang”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

To anticipate a claim, the cited reference must teach each and every element of the claim. MPEP § 2131. As explained hereinafter, Claim 1 recites at least one feature that is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Wang*.

1. *Wang* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “in response to authenticating and authorizing the client, sending an **authorization accept message** that includes an accounting record within the message.

Claim 1 features:

“A method for improving service accounting in a network, the method comprising the steps of:
in an authentication, authorization, and accounting server:
authenticating and authorizing a client;
in response to authenticating and authorizing the client, sending an authorization accept message that includes an accounting record within the message; and
causing the accounting record to be logged.” (Emphasis added.)

Therefore, Claim 1 features an authentication, authorization, and accounting server that, in response to authenticating and authorizing a client, sends an **authorization accept message** that **includes an accounting record within the message**. For example, in an embodiment, information retrieved from an external resource server, needed by the authentication, authorization, and accounting server to authorize the client, comprises the accounting record sent within the authorization accept message. See Specification, [0044].

Wang at paragraph [0187] states:

When a WAP device logs on the wireless network, the IWF/GGSN/PDSN authenticates the WAP device, authorizes its accesses and also accounts for the log on event. This is done by communicating with the AAA server as shown in FIG. 3. In FIG. 3, the IWF/GGSN/PDSN is configured using User&Device Identification (232) as the AM server. The User & Device Identification (232) takes an AAA request, extracts the required data and forwards the request to the actual AAA server. Interesting parameters in an AAA record include Calling-Station-Id (represents the MSISDN), Framed-IP-Address (represents the IP address) and Acct-Status-Type (Start or Stop) RADIUS attributes in the **Accounting-Request packets**.

Therefore, *Wang* at paragraph [0187] discloses authorizing a WAP device to access a wireless network by communicating with an authentication, authorization, and accounting server. *Wang* further discloses in paragraph [0187] and in Figure 3 extracting RADIUS attributes from **accounting-request packets** on their way from the IWF/GGSN/PDSN to the authentication, authorization, and accounting server. In conventional use of RADIUS, an accounting-request packet contains the RADIUS attributes extracted in *Wang* as the very purpose of an accounting request is to convey accounting information from a client to an authentication, authorization, and accounting server.

In contrast to *Wang*, Claim 1 features sending an accounting record within an **authorization accept message** from an authentication, authorization, and accounting server in response to authorizing and authenticating a client. Thus, the approach of claim 1 communicates accounting data in a completely different way than *Wang* or conventional practice with RADIUS. *Wang* does not disclose an authorization accept message or sending an accounting record in an authorization accept message. The **accounting-request packet** disclosed in *Wang* is sent by the client and is not an authorization accept message sent from an authentication, authorization, and accounting server in response to authorizing and authentication a client.

Applicants' approach is unexpected, counter-intuitive, and completely contrary to the approach of *Wang*. Therefore, *Wang* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "in response to authenticating and authorizing the client, sending an authorization accept message that includes an accounting record within the message".

Based on the foregoing, because *Wang* fails to teach or suggest all the features of Claim 1, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. CLAIM 15 – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) – WANG

Independent Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by "Wang" "Wang"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 15 recites features similar to the features recited in Claim 1 that is deemed to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, Independent Claim 15 is allowable for at least those reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. REMAINING CLAIMS

The pending claims not discussed so far are defendant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each defendant claim includes the features of claims upon which they depend, the defendant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the defendant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the defendant claims and allowance of the defendant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the defendant claims introduce additional features that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental differences already identified, a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Date: October 24, 2007

/AdamCStone#60531/

Adam Christopher Stone
Reg. No. 60,531

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 231
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076